EXHIBIT K

February 24, 2022 Hearing Transcript

Page 1 1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 Case No. 18-23538-rdd Adv. Case No. 19-08432-rdd 5 6 In the Matter of: 7 8 SEARS HOLDINGS CORPORATION, et al., 9 10 Debtors. 11 12 KMART HOLDING CORPORATION, 13 Plaintiff, 14 v. 15 GRACE AND SON CONSTRUCTION COMPANY OF GREENVILLE, 16 Defendant. 17 18 19 United States Bankruptcy Court 20 300 Quarropas Street, Room 248 21 White Plains, NY 10601 22 23 February 24, 2022 24 10:05 a.m. 25

Page 3 1 HEARING re Notice of Agenda of Matters Scheduled for Hearing 2 to be Conducted Through Zoom on February 24, 2022 at 10:00 3 a.m. (ECF #10327) 5 HEARING re Notice of Presentment of Order Authorizing 6 Certain Distributions filed by Garrett A. Fail on behalf of 7 Sears Holdings Corporation. Objections due by 2/17/2022 8 (ECF #10294) 9 10 HEARING re Letter / Notice of Limited Remand Filed by Robert 11 Craig Martin on behalf of Transform Holdco LLC. (ECF #10318) 12 13 HEARING re Notice of Hearing on Scheduling Order for 14 Transform Holdco LLC's Motion to Enforce the Order (I) 15 Authorizing Assumption and Assignment of Lease with MOAC 16 Mall Holdings LLC and (II) Granting Related Relief (related 17 document(s) 10194, 10298, 10289) filed by Rachel Ehrlich Albanese on behalf of Transform Holdco LLC. (ECF #10305) 18 19 20 HEARING re Related Document: Motion to Compel / Motion to 21 Enforce the Order (I) Authorizing Assumption and Assignment 22 of Lease with MOAC Mall Holdings LLC and (II) Granting Related Relief filed by Richard A. Chesley on behalf of 23 24 Transform Holdco LLC with hearing to be held on 1/20/2022 at 25 02:00 PM at Courtroom TBA, White Plains Courthouse (RDD)

Page 4 1 Responses due by 1/13/2022. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A # 2 Exhibit B # 3 Exhibit C # 4 Exhibit D # 5 Exhibit E # 6 2 Exhibit F # 7 Exhibit G # 8 Exhibit H # 9 Exhibit I # 10 3 Exhibit J) (ECF #10194) 4 5 6 HEARING re Notice of Presentment of Scheduling Order for 7 Transform Holdco LLC's Motion to Enforce the Order (I) 8 Authorizing Assumption and Assignment of Lease with MOAC 9 Mall Holdings LLC and (II) Granting Related Relief (related 10 document(s) 10194) filed by Rachel Ehrlich Albanese on 11 behalf of Transform Holdco LLC. (ECF #10289) 12 13 HEARING re Objection to Notice of Presentment of Scheduling 14 Order (related document(s) 10289) filed by Gregory S. Otsuka 15 on behalf of MOAC Mall Holding LLC. (ECF #10298) 16 17 HEARING re Adversary Proceeding: 19-08432-rdd Kmart Holding 18 Corporation v. Grace and Son Construction Company of 19 Greenville, Amended Order to Show Cause signed on 1/20/2022 20 why an answer with attorney representation has not been 21 filed by Defendant, Grace and Son Construction Company of 22 Greenville, Inc. and why Defendant has not retained counsel to represent it in this adversary proceeding (related 23 document(s) 7) with hearing to be held on 2/24/2022 at 10:00 24 25 AM at Videoconference (ZoomGov) (ECF #9)

Page 5 HEARING re Certificate of Service (related document(s) 7) filed by Brigette McGrath on behalf of Kmart Holding Corporation. (ECF #7) Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

	Page 6
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES, LLP
4	Attorneys for the Debtor
5	767 Fifth Avenue
6	New York, NY 10153
7	
8	BY: GARRETT A. FAIL (TELEPHONICALLY)
9	
10	QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART, SULLIVAN, LLP
11	Attorneys for Administrative Expense Claims
12	Representative
13	1300 I Street NW, Suite 900
14	Washington, D.C. 20005
15	
16	BY: ERIKA MORABITO (TELEPHONICALLY)
17	
18	ASK, LLP
19	Attorneys for the Plaintiff
20	2600 Eagan Woods Drive, Suite 400
21	St. Paul, MN 55121
22	
23	BY: RICHARD J. REDING (TELEPHONICALLY)
24	
25	ROPES & GRAY LLP

	Page 7
1	Attorneys for MOAC Mall Holdings LLC
2	1211 Avenue of the Americas
3	New York, NY 10036
4	
5	BY: GREGG GALARDI (TELEPHONICALLY)
6	
7	DLA PIPER
8	Attorneys for Transform Holdco and MOAC
9	1251 6th Avenue
10	New York, NY 10020
11	
12	BY: CRAIG MARTIN (TELEPHONICALLY)
13	
14	ALSO PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY:
15	JOSEPH GRACE, Pro se
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Okay, good morning. This is Judge

Drain. We are here in In re Sears Holdings Corporation, et

al. I have the agenda for today's hearings and I'm happy to

go down that. Each of these matters is being heard remotely

primarily by Zoom unless someone doesn't have access to a

screen, in which case they are appearing by telephone.

So the first matter on the agenda is listed as an uncontested matter, but I'm glad it's on the agenda because it's somewhat -- it was a proposed order sought by notice of presentment without a motion itself or a memorandum of law supporting the notice of presentment. And I was a little confused about the nature of the relief being sought. So I'm not sure I would have entered the order without further explanation in any event. But we are here I gather for that explanation. So someone from the Debtors I assume is going to talk about this one.

MR. FAIL: Good morning, Your Honor. It's Garrett Fail from Weil Gotshal for the Debtors.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. FAIL: Good morning. So we did file a notice of presentment at Docket 10294. It was consistent with my presentation at the last hearing and consistent with the notices that we had filed at Docket 10295 and the status report at Docket 10240.

So what we announced at that last hearing, Judge, was that the Debtors were prepared to make another distribution, the fourth distribution, pursuant to the administrative consent program and the confirmation order and that the Debtors determined after consultation with not only their restructuring committee but also the preeffective date committee, which included the administrative claims representative and the representative selected by the UCC, as well as each of those individuals' counsel and financial advisors, that to increase the administrative deficiencies of the cases going forward and consistent with past orders of this Court permitting distributions to what were de minimis claims, the Debtors could satisfy up to 200 claims administrative claims that were opt-in or non-optout, so not changing who would receive the money, but that there were 200 parties that were owed \$20,000 and that if we -- \$20,000 which goes up to their 75 percent or 80 percent cap depending on which category they fall into.

And so rather than making smaller distributions over time, keeping track of claims on trade, checking for tax IDs and OFAC forms, dealing with checks that didn't get cashed, you know, and dealing with all of the mailings, that we could end 200 additional parties' involvement with the cases.

Your Honor had previously approved it in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

connection with the first distribution of de minimis procedure which allowed us to satisfy -- I forget the exact number -- between a thousand and 1,200, 1,300 claims of similar entitlement. But at this point in time after three previous distributions, 200 parties were owed \$20,000, and we decided to move forward. We had announced that at the last status conference. We filed the notice of presentment to permit that as well as to permit the payment of certain prepetition priority taxes which I've previewed at the status conference as well. Those claims continue to assert interest. The parties that are in this taxing jurisdiction, some continue to file claims that have to be addressed by M3, some just keep updating their websites. The goal would be to pay less than a million dollars to satisfy over 70, 80 parties and take them off the board as well.

So there were no objections to that, and we worked with the administrative claims rep, as I mentioned, and the pre-effective date committee to get their sign on. And they've reached out to some of their constituents as well, including some of the larger administrative claimholders who were supportive of it.

The reason that we put the notice of presentment on for today, in our minds, it wasn't to further support that we thought that that was accepted, but it was to share good news with parties in interest following our filing of

the distribution notice, which projected that the Debtors would be able to hit the 50 percent distribution to remaining creditors and satisfy up to \$20,000 to 200 parties.

The Debtors were successful in collecting cash and reducing expenses, and collectively between those efforts and recalculating disputed claims reserve, we'll be able to make an additional distribution beyond what was announced previously.

So as a result, instead of distributing \$17.7 million, up to \$18.6 million can go out the door. And that would allow -- and so then the question was amongst the parties making the distribution and the parties in interest, where should that go. The Debtors again consulted with the pre-effective date committee with the support of the administrative claims rep, and we were told holders of large claims we proposed to increase the de minimis distribution cap from \$20,000 to \$25,000. That would increase the number of claims that could be satisfied to 230. It would leave, Your Honor, only 214 opt-ins and non-opt-out claims to be satisfied. It would leave only 196 claimants to be satisfied in those categories. So for a small amount extra, we could pay off more than half of the parties that are collecting distributions and we could also increase the distribution to those remaining from 50 to 51 percent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So if Your Honor is inclined to grant the motion, we would propose two changes. One is that the conditions to satisfy these de minimis claims would be satisfied only when the Debtors are able to pay 51 percent to the remaining rather than the 50 we proposed, and we believe we are. So it's not going to be a question.

And then we would change the de minimis threshold from 20 to 25. And out of the 444 expected claims, we think we satisfy 230, leaving 214. So we think it's good news.

We think it's a fair allocation and further progress in the case.

THE COURT: Okay. I just have the following questions on this. First, under the confirmation order, there was a procedure for dealing with administrative claims with the opt-in/opt-out, et cetera. Is it the parties' belief that under that program, there is authority to make these distributions, i.e. on notice? There's no limitation, for example, on what can be paid on smaller claims, et cetera? In other words, is this matter of discretion and the Debtors are exercising their discretion in consultation with the representative of the Administrative Expense Group, et cetera?

MR. FAIL: Everything is discretionary with Court approval, Judge, right? So we don't think we have the authority to do it. We don't think we have to -- without

Court authority. We don't think that the prior de minimis order -- the prior de minimis order, when you read the language, was limited to the claims that we identified in the first round. THE COURT: No, I agree. The prior de minimis order doesn't limit what you can do in the future. I just want to make sure it's your understanding that under the plan, which I really can't amend or can't approve an amendment of in this fashion at least, there is authority to make this distribution. MR. FAIL: We think it's consistent with the authority that you granted in the order in aid of execution of the plan the first time following confirmation. That permitted the payment of 1,200 out of the 1,500, whatever the numbers were. But this proportion of majority of claims were satisfied in full --THE COURT: I just want to make -- it's often the case in plans that a plan authorizes de minimis claimants to get a distribution up to a certain amount and no more. Sometimes it's a hundred percent without interest, sometimes it's 75 percent, et cetera. I don't think there's that type of provision here. MR. FAIL: You are correct, Judge. There isn't. THE COURT: Okay. That's what I wanted

confirmation of. So the condition here from the larger

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and the Court. I think the only difference is in the words

I think I am generally in agreement with Mr. Fail

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

consult versus consent.

I do believe that any -- I don't want to say modification, but any exercise of discretion with respect to de minimis amounts that can be paid that may be inconsistent if you will generally with what the plan allowed in terms of the claims procedures order I do think can be addressed between counsel and the Administrative Claims Representative with the Administrative Claims Representative's consent.

Not just consulting with us and saying we consulted and they went ahead and did it. That would be the only distinction that I would draw. But generally, I think what's been stated is accurate.

THE COURT: And the representative --

MR. FAIL: I don't know if that's true or not, but I'm happy to say we have their consent --

THE COURT: Well, that's my next question. The representative has consent though to this modification --

MR. MORABITO: We have consented to this modification, Your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: -- of the order that was submitted.

Okay. Did anyone else have anything to say on this motion?

All right. I will grant the motion. Again, my only concern was I wanted to have confirmation that there was in fact the consent and that the parties agree with me that this wasn't a modification of the plan, this relief. I am satisfied

that there is the consent and that it's not a modification of the plan. And further, the request is unopposed, albeit that the Debtor is now seeking to increase the amount that would go out as part of a fourth distribution.

In a business matter, the distribution makes sense. We deal with the tax issues first. Given the accrual of significant interest claims that could be also a hundred cent type of claim, it makes sense to pay those amounts now which are undisputed.

administrative expense creditors that would be receiving payment in full, that payment amount is relatively modest and there is a significant burden in continuing to track those claims. At this point it would pay off more than half of the administrative expense creditors in full, which is a worthy goal in itself here. That goal wouldn't be meetable, however, if there was significant opposition and if there wasn't there wasn't consent by the Administrative Claims Representative. But there is no opposition and there is that consent.

So I will enter the order that you've described as a modified order, Mr. Fail, which you can send to chambers.

MR. FAIL: Thank you very much, Your Honor. Appreciate it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FAIL: The next item on the agenda I believe is going to be handled by Transform (indiscernible).

THE COURT: Okay. I want to -- I actually, because I think this may not take as long, actually skip the Transform matter and go to the third item on the agenda, which is K-Mart Holding Corp. v. Grace and Son Construction Company of Greenville. And I'm doing that in part because I believe that counsel for the Debtor-Plaintiff as well as at least a businessperson from the Defendant here are on the screen. And again, I think this is probably a matter that can be dealt with fairly quickly.

It was scheduled by an amended order to show cause that I entered on January 20, 2022, and that order to show cause stated, it is hereby ordered that the duly authorized representative of the parties to that adversary proceeding shall appear on February 24, 2022 to show cause why an answer with attorney representation has not been filed by Defendant, Grace and Son Construction Company of Greenville Inc., and why Defendant has not retained counsel to represent them in this adversary proceeding.

Absent the Defendant's appearance and setting forth sufficient cause why it may proceed pro se as a corporate entity, Plaintiff may move for default judgment to be entered pursuant to Rule 55(b)(2) of the Rules of Civil Procedure. And then citing, among other cases, City of New

called pro hac vice application, which are routinely granted, there are about 200 of them at least in the Sears case, to appear and represent your corporation in this adversary proceeding.

MR. GRACE: Okay.

THE COURT: He doesn't have to be admitted generally to the bar in New York or the Southern District of New York. He can just make that type of application. There are a lot of them on the docket that he can just copy. It's pretty much a form.

MR. GRACE: Yes, sir. I felt like I don't even need a lawyer. My contact with them was one job that I did

THE COURT: I understand that, sir. And you have filed an answer and you've responded to interrogatories and the like. But the rule is really clear in the Second Circuit and elsewhere around the country. And it's not just a full employment for lawyers rule, it really -- there is a reason behind it, which is that the courts want to have someone who is within the bar of the court, which includes being admitted pro hac, as I explained it, that is answerable as a lawyer for the conduct of the litigation for each party.

So it may be that your in-house counsel may not be doing very much, but he needs to be involved as counsel of

use in the construction business. But it's important to

have a lawyer here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 21 1 But I will accept a lawyer who is a member of the 2 bar of -- you said South Carolina? 3 MR. GRACE: Yes, that's correct. THE COURT: All that person needs to do is file an 4 5 application and email it to my chambers. 6 MR. GRACE: Okay. 7 THE COURT: That's called a pro hac vice 8 application in which this person says I am a member in good 9 standing of the bar of State of South Carolina and I 10 requested admission pro hac vice to the bar of the Southern 11 District of New York for purposes of this adversary 12 proceeding. And the caption would be the caption of the 13 adversary proceeding. And as a matter of routine, those are 14 entered. Your in-house person can look at the docket in the 15 Sears case -- the number of that is on the pleadings -- and 16 he'll find about at least 200 of these. There is a fee 17 involved. There is a filing fee, but it's pretty modest. 18 So you don't have to go and hire an outside 19 lawyer. You don't have to hire a lawyer from New York. You 20 can use your in-house counsel. 21 MR. GRACE: Yes, sir. Thank you. But I, I guess 22 wanted it banned because all my stuff was prior to them 23 declaring bankruptcy. 24 THE COURT: But that's the -- again, this is --25 you're in this case because of an adversary proceeding where

Page 22 1 they're suing your company for having gotten a preference, 2 i.e. a payment on account of debt before the bankruptcy. And so it's a specific set of issues under 547 of the 3 Bankruptcy Code. And it will be dealt with -- there are 4 5 procedures in place for dealing with these types of 6 adversary proceedings in the case. Your in-house counsel 7 can look at them to the extent you want him to. But I need someone who is appearing on behalf of your company as a 8 9 lawyer. And your in-house person can do that. All he has 10 to do is do this pro hac application. 11 MR. GRACE: Okay. Well, thank you, sir. 12 appreciate that. 13 THE COURT: Okav. 14 MR. GRACE: I will get him to do that. 15 THE COURT: I'll give you 30 days to do that. 16 it's not done, then the Plaintiff, K-Mart, can move for a 17 default judgment. But 30 days should be more than enough 18 time to do that. Again, go on the docket, he can find one 19 of these samples, do the same thing, just filling in his 20 information. It's two paragraphs. It's really simple. 21 MR. GRACE: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Okay, fine. 23 MR. GRACE: Okay, thank you. 24 THE COURT: Okay, very well. So you can sign off, 25 as can Mr. Reding.

1 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. REDING: 2 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So let's go back 3 then to the second and I think last matter on the calendar, 4 the other matters being adjourned, which is the latest step 5 in the Transform Holdco/MOAC Mall Holdings LLC dispute. 6 This particular matter was a notice of presentment of 7 scheduling order for Transform Holdco LLC's motion to 8 enforce the order, one, authorizing assumption and 9 assignment of lease with MOAC Mall Holdings LLC, and two, 10 granting related relief that was sought by notice of 11 presentment, but MOAC objected to it. 12 I have read the objection as well as the reply, 13 and I'm happy to hear a brief oral argument on it. Why 14 don't I take the parties' appearances first and then I do 15 have a couple of questions for the parties that will help me 16 understand the posture that we're in here. 17 MR. MARTIN: Good morning, Your Honor. This is 18 Craig Martin from DLA Piper. Can you hear me all right? 19 THE COURT: Yes. Fine, thanks. 20 MR. MARTIN: Appearing on behalf of Transform 21 Holdco and also for MOAC appears. We did also file a notice 22 of the remand under Bankruptcy Rule --THE COURT: Right. And I've seen that. 23 24 MR. MARTIN: Just making sure you saw that. turn it over to MOAC's counsel for their appearance. 25

- February 24 2022 Hearing Transcript Pg 25 of 57 Page 24 1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 MR. GALARDI: Good morning, Your Honor. Gregg Galardi on behalf of MOAC Mall Holdings LLC. Good to see 3 I understand that this is a new face, but I'll 4 you again. 5 be representing MOAC on this response today. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Good morning. Well, it's not a 7 new case, it's actually an old one. But I'm sure --8 MR. GALARDI: Old one with new faces. 9 THE COURT: I'm sure you've come up to speed with 10 it. 11 MR. GALARDI: I have, Your Honor. THE COURT: So the most recent iteration of the 12 13 parties' disputes, which have been not only before me but 14 before the district court and the circuit and are now the 15 subject of a cert petition was the motion by Transform that 16 I referenced here, i.e. to enforce the assignment order and 17 for related relief. And I had a hearing on that motion 18 which was opposed by MOAC on January 20. 19 The primary and basically exclusive reason for the

opposition that I addressed then was that the assignment order was still subject to the appellate process. mandate had not been issued, and in fact, there was a motion to stay the issuance of the mandate by MOAC pending determination of a petition for certiorari to the supreme court on the 363(m) issue and if cert was granted through

20

21

22

23

24

the supreme court's determination.

So the issue really came down in large part, although there were subsidiary issues that were touched on, to whether the divestiture doctrine applied to the determination that Transform Holdco was seeking. And the primary focus was a concern that a condition of the assignment order, which was that, as stated in Paragraph 17, the buyer, that is Transform, must initially sublet a portion of the premises for the designated lease within two years on the condition that the counterparty to the designated lease does not improperly interfere with the buyer's attempt to sublet the premises for the designated lease.

Even with the extension granted by the circuit, that two-year period would expire before Transform could close its transaction with the proposed subtenant. And I dealt with that concern, which was the most pressing one, by suggesting that I was prepared to give an indicative ruling that -- I'm sorry, under Bankruptcy Rule 8008, that my order did not contemplate a situation where Transform had actively sought a subtenant, had located a subtenant. And the two years would expire because of not a delay in obtaining a subtenant, but rather the litigation battle on appeal that ensued after my order authorizing the assumption of assignment.

And yes, Mr. Martin, I have seen the order from the Second Circuit which stated after noting the indicative ruling, "Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure six and 12.1, this Court remands to the Bankruptcy Court for the limited purpose of ruling on the issue of the two-year deadline. The deadline contained in the August 17, 2021 order --" that's the order of the circuit that told the deadline for 60 days, "-- is tolled until the bankruptcy court's resolution of this issue. The Court otherwise retains jurisdiction over this appeal.

I will also note that I am aware that the Circuit also granted MOAC's motion for a stay of the issuance of the mandate pending the filing and disposition of a petition for writ of certiorari.

So I guess I have one other sort of stage-setting question for this, which is MOAC had made a motion to the circuit that sought alternative forms of relief, either an extension by the circuit of the deadline to sublease, or alternatively, the remand in respect of the indicative ruling. I think it was in respect of that motion that the circuit remanded.

I just want to confirm, Mr. Martin, there's nothing left of that motion then, right? The motion isn't before the Circuit still? You're not seeking the other relief at the same time?

MR. MARTIN: No. You're correct, Your Honor. Those were alternative requests and we view the order that we submitted as resolving that motion and putting the matter back before Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. So clearly one thing is back before me at least, which is the form, if you will, of the order on the two-year deadline, which I generally indicated would be consistent with my indicative ruling, which is that it wouldn't apply. There was some discussion on the record of the January 20 hearing as to whether it should just be couched in terms of a reasonable period beyond the two years or whether it should be a full two years, or something in between. And I gather that there has been some -- well, there was an agreement -- correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Galardi -- that the deadline would not apply at all to the current proposed subtenant. MR. GALARDI: I agree that we offered that. don't know if Mr. Martin and Transform --THE COURT: You're right. It was offered by MOAC. And I don't know whether that was agreed. And I guess that would have left the other issues open. MR. GALARDI: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: But in any event, it appears to me that that set of issues, what is the appropriate extension

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of the two-year deadline, is clearly before me.

Transform, consistent with remarks that I made at the January 20 hearing, has also assumed -- and it's reasonable for Transform to assume that since I said the next step would be a scheduling order -- that also before me would be two of the three issues that it raised in the underlying motion to enforce the assumption of assignment order, namely whether there are any limitations under the lease with respect to this proposed subtenant, who we're not identifying by agreement. The parties have all agreed that we wouldn't identify that entity. And then whether the right of first offer, or ROFO has been properly exercised or not.

The third request in the motion was whether the so-called litigation contingency in the proposed sublease has been satisfied. And I don't believe that -- well, that's not listed as the two issues, and I think quite properly so given that there is a stay of the mandate and a pending motion for -- I think there's already a motion for cert. Right, Mr. Galardi?

MR. GALARDI: No, Your Honor. I think it's due to be filed on March 17.

THE COURT: Okay. But it's intended.

MR. GALARDI: It's intended to be filed. That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So really I think for the first time in its objection to the scheduling order on those two issues, MOAC raised the issue of the court's jurisdiction to decide those two issues, both subject matter and in personam jurisdiction.

The earlier jurisdictional issue that it had raised was really under the divesture doctrine, not under 28 USC 1334. And obviously the Court's jurisdiction is a gatekeeping issue. So I don't think there's really an issue with the scheduling order itself. It's really just the jurisdictional point.

Transform's response, other than saying that I've already ruled on that issue, I don't think really goes into it in any detail. It's a short response. And I really don't believe I have ruled on that issue yet since it wasn't really raised.

I know that the reply by Transform states that I sent an email, which of course I did, on February 7 saying that the evidentiary hearing should remain on the calendar as scheduled, which was I think from March 25. But that was in response to an adjournment request by one of MOAC's counsel from February 2nd that really didn't raise the jurisdictional issue, it raised calendar management issues. This is Mr. Otsuka's letter where he basically says since only two of the three issues are being decided or would be

decided, why don't you put it off because it's basically a waste of time. If the petition for cert is granted, it's possible that those other two issues would become moot and the Court would have wasted their time in deciding them.

And really didn't raise the subject matter jurisdiction issues that are raised in the he objection.

And as far as the remarks about a scheduling order at the January 20 hearing, again, the issue of subject matter jurisdiction I don't think really had been raised other than the divestiture doctrine because there was the appeal. And I said that I would contemplate the need for an evidentiary hearing on the two issues because evidence would be required. But again, I was not -- the issue of my subject matter jurisdiction was not raised, I think. It certainly wasn't discussed at that hearing.

And I think that in part, this really depends on the timing issue from the section of the assumption and assignment order that I previously quoted if -- put it differently. If MOAC is shown, as set forth in the -- or if it is alleged that MOAC is "improperly" interfering with buyer's attempt to sublet the premises for the designated lease, then I think it's pretty clear I do have jurisdiction that falls within interpreting my order and enforcing that order as to the two-year period under really a lot of caselaw, I guess going back to Petrie Retail, but including

Judge Gerber's decision in In re Ames Department Stores Inc., 317 B.R. 250 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2004) and really an enormous, I think at this point, body of caselaw that says that if the issue is the application of the court's order and the interpretation of it, then that's arising in jurisdiction and a core matter. It's Judge Gerber again -but there are plenty of other cases by other judges in the Southern District that agree with him -- got so worked up with that proposition in In re Motors Liquidation Co, 514 B.R. 377 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2014), which was reversed on other grounds, not on the jurisdictional point, that he called the contention frivolous, "disregarding controlling decisions of the United States Supreme Court and Second Circuit; district court authority in this District, four earlier decisions that I personally have issued and three decisions by other bankruptcy judges in the Southern District emulating treatise", Collier.

But on the other hand, if the issue is not that timing point -- and I know you haven't briefed this yet, Mr.

Martin -- but if the issue is not that timing issue and if that issue really isn't in front of me because it's conceded that the two-year period isn't going to run, I'm not sure what the hook is here as opposed to just going to state court and saying, look, we have an acceptable tenant, the lease doesn't prevent it, MOAC is frustrating our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

assignment, we seek injunctive relief and monetary relief.

Mr. Martin. If we're going to go ahead with the schedule on the two issues, I think the first step would be briefing that issue. But I guess I'm sort of giving you a heads up on how I think it will probably come out. And maybe the parties should just be focusing on what's clearly in front of me first, which is, is there going to be any issue about the two years. If there is, then I think we kind of shoehorn into this other dispute. But if there isn't, I'm not sure -- I'm having a hard time seeing a hook. Because I'm not really interpreting my order at that point. The order says that the lease is assigned. It's assigned, as the lease is. You're just asking me to interpret the provisions of the lease.

And there's no prior determination by me, as there was in the Ames case and as there was in the Petrie Retail case, on the merits of those two issues. So by raising those two issues, I don't think MOAC is challenging my order. They're accepting that it's assigned for purposes of this litigation, although they have the pending appeal. And I think that is an important distinction between this matter if we're not dealing with that provision in Paragraph 17, the two-year period and the other caselaw.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, I can affirm on the

record -- and I affirm on the record that we deem with respect to this subtenant to be satisfied, waived, with respect to this proposed subtenant and that sublease.

THE COURT: Okay. So I know you're facing what you've referred to and I think what I may have referred to as a business deadline as well, i.e. the terms of the sublease. But the bankruptcy court isn't the only court in the country that's sensitive to business deadlines. Courts have TROs just for that purpose.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Your Honor. I was letting you finish. If you are, I'll be happy to respond.

THE COURT: Yeah. And I'm sorry for going on at length, but I just wanted to lay that out. I'm fully expecting you to respond to those points.

MR. MARTIN: Very helpful to get the Court's thoughts. Two quick comments and then an idea. The first comment is I certainly appreciate the Court's statements on not having ruled on the 1334(b) issues. I did review the transcript of January 20 and there was a portion of the colloquy where the Court talked about if Transform had not paid cure, that you would have core jurisdiction to interpret the order. And since we are viewing this as interpreting the order, we consider that the cases that you cited today and the points you made had been squarely before the Court. But certainly understand that you feel the need

1 to look at it.

And we certainly feel that under 1334(b), your jurisdiction is original, but not exclusive. So we submit that you have continuing subject matter jurisdiction.

I want to comment though on Mr. Galardi's conception that the two years doesn't apply with respect to this sublease. If that concession also includes an acknowledgement that we have satisfied the right of first refusal and that this tenant is appropriate, that would in fact solve the problem. But simply saying that two years is satisfied but continuing to object to our provision of the 6.3(a) right and its rejection and coming forward with a tenant that is appropriate under the lease in accordance with Paragraph 17 of the order, we submit leaves those issues open in front of Your Honor with subject matter jurisdiction and can be decided.

THE COURT: Well, let me make sure. Is there a timing issue on the right of first refusal?

MR. MARTIN: The rights in Paragraph 17 are separate. So the first part of that paragraph says that we must comply with Section 6.3(a). and then the separate condition is that we lease at least a portion of the property within the two-year period. So what we did is we notified them of the fact that we had entered into the sublease and gave them the right of first refusal. They

responded to that by stating that they reject the right of first refusal subject to the fact that they object that the tenant is an appropriate tenant under the lease. So it's not clear to us that they have actually acknowledged that we gave them and that they rejected the 6.3(a) right as provided for in Paragraph 17.

THE COURT: But again, look, I don't want to go too far with this. But I'm trying to lay out for you all -- because ultimately what we are here on is a scheduling matter. That's what we're here on today.

MR. MARTIN: And that's why I had an idea --

THE COURT: -- is that if the parties can't resolve the issue on Paragraph 17 of the order, the two-year period and the improperly interfering language, then I think the first thing you need to put in the scheduling order is briefing on the jurisdictional points. And then you can put in the scheduling order if the Court finds jurisdiction, we'll deal with the following issues in the following manner. And maybe that's all that we're going to come out with today. But I'm also suggesting to you that that may lead to the expense of valuable time for Transform with the result where the Court may well find that there isn't jurisdiction.

If in fact there is an agreement that the two-year period is just not going to apply here -- now, the reason I

asked you about the right of first refusal is that I guess I can understand that you would want to include that in an agreement by MOAC that it wouldn't apply to this tenant, subtenant, if there was a time limit also on exercising the right of first refusal or making that right available. But I didn't hear from your answer and I don't remember from the lease, but I don't think this is the case, that there is such a time limit. It's kind of a standalone provision that the owner has to fish or cut bait on the right of first refusal. And if it doesn't, it doesn't.

So unless they're basically saying, which I don't think they're saying, you haven't really brought me a deal yet that I can exercise my right of first refusal on, I'm not sure why you're pressing for that extra concession. But that's not a ruling. It's just some guidance on where we want to go with this litigation.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I think you hit the nail on the head, Your Honor, which is the last sentence that you said is exactly our concern. The time limits are in Section 6.3(a). We believe we've complied with them. They reserve their right to object to the fact that we have.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know if you've discussed this among ourselves. I think you probably ought to.

Because, again, one thing is clear. I need to issue an order on the remand, which is just what to do about this

two-year period in Paragraph 17. If you can agree on that, that may just end it. So I actually said the first thing would be briefing jurisdiction, but I actually don't think that's the first thing. The first thing is to give you time to agree on the form of that order if you can. If you can't, just tell me. And if you can't agree on it, then we'll deal with the jurisdictional briefing point, which you would put at the front of your scheduling order and just suggest the deadlines accordingly for a ruling on jurisdiction.

But if there's an offer that doesn't prejudice

Transform as to the timing point on this subtenant, I don't

understand why we're even here. At that point I think

you're in all likelihood in state court in Minnesota or

federal court in Minnesota and seeking injunctive relief to

enforce the lease.

Now, it may be that that court would say, you know, unlike my reaction to Mr. Otsuka's letter, I want to see what this report does first, that's possible, I guess.

But on the other hand, you do have a deal issue, and this Court may say no, I'm going to hear this on a fast schedule.

You know, depending on what the Supreme Court does, I want the parties to be ready one way or another on this issue.

But I do think there is a distinguishing -- subject to seeing briefing of course -- fact here, which is

from all the cases like, you know, Travelers, Petrie Retail, Ames, GM, Portrait Corp of America, all those cases dealt with issues that the bankruptcy court in approving a sale or an assignment had already addressed. Either what was free and clear, what wasn't free and clear, what had to be paid, what didn't. And then the owner or the party asserting an interest turned around and sued the buyer or assignee for breaching provisions of the lease or on account of interest that the bankruptcy had already said didn't have to be cured. So other than this two-year period, I don't see a provision in my order that says that you have to exercise the right of first refusal in this way.

So I understand the timing point. Maybe I don't remember the right of first refusal provision accurately, but I don't think -- well, put it differently. If MOAC is saying we'll waive the two-year period for this subtenant, but they have their fingers crossed behind their back and they're saying ah-ha, but we're going to get you on the ROFO because two years has passed and there's some limitation on making it available to us to exercise the ROFO. I understand that point completely, and I think MOAC should realize that they're going to lose if they -- you know, point that out to me on the order on remand. But otherwise, I'm having a hard time seeing why this would be different than any other breach claim. You know, in this case they're

breaching the lease by not exercising the ROFO right.

MR. MARTIN: I certainly understand Your Honor's

point. And to summarize, I think I'm certainly happy to

meet and confer with Mr. Galardi over the remand portion of the order. He submitted a case in the last couple of days,

but we obviously know each other quite well. So, happy to

7 do that.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then to update on the if we are unable to reach an agreement on some of the issues that give us concern over our timing and jurisdictional issues, happy to amend the scheduling order to put briefing in first.

THE COURT: So the amendments to the scheduling order if you can't reach agreement on the remand point would be first a hearing on the proper form of that order.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

THE COURT: Second, the briefing on jurisdiction, and then build in a period for discovery and an evidentiary hearing assuming for the moment that I found that there was jurisdiction. Obviously, that would go away if I didn't.

And you can -- frankly, you could combine the first two in one hearing. You know, it's not an evidentiary hearing, it's just I'll decide what's the proper form of the order and then the jurisdictional point.

MR. MARTIN: Right. And that's what I wanted to update Your Honor on. We have in fact exchanged pretty

limited document requests with one another, even though this scheduling order was pending. But as you appreciate, we have our deal clock ticking. So it may be that we go ahead and confer with Mr. Galardi over that and proceed with discovery.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I did have one other suggestion to you all which I'll just throw out, which is if this fight is not over ultimately whether this is a great subtenant or not, but just who gets the money from the subtenant, I don't see why either side doesn't agree to the subtenancy, reserving all rights to the money. Then you at least get someone occupying the space, which isn't very attractive to the Mall of America, and they can just -- you can just fight over the money.

Now, I'm not saying that they necessarily are the best subtenant that you could find, or that they're even a qualifying subtenant. But if the parties actually deep down understand that they are, you know, get them in there, get them paying rent, and then have the rent just set aside until there is a decision on the cert petition. And if it's granted, you know, a decision by the supreme court. And then you have the bird in hand, you have the money, and the only issue is who it goes to.

So I'm just throwing that out. No one has to comment on that. But I don't see why you wouldn't talk

about that, too.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'm glad you threw it out.

Because if you looked at the affidavits we submitted in the Second Circuit, we've made that offer in the past. And hopefully something that MOAC might be willing to look at again.

THE COURT: Yeah. I'm just not sure there's a whole lot of negotiating leverage in keeping them out, in other words. But I'm just throwing that out.

Let's go back to the scheduling order. I think you all know what I have in mind as far as the scheduling order. And hopefully you'll reach agreement on the terms of resolving the two-year period which was, you know, what the remand clearly dealt with.

MR. GALARDI: Your Honor, it's Gregg Galardi. I learned long ago not to say anything when I think you've done exactly what we asked to do. So I appreciate it, and we'll work with Mr. Martin on the form of order.

THE COURT: Okay, very well. So I think that should probably take no more than a week. I mean, I know there are some difficult issues to work through, but it's basically a couple paragraphs in the sublease agreement to focus on. And so I think by next Friday -- not tomorrow, but next Friday if you haven't done that, you should get to Ms. Li a date for the hearing on the first two points on the

Page 42 1 scheduling order, which would be the proper form of that 2 order that the circuit remanded for me to decide and the 3 jurisdiction point. 4 MR. GALARDI: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Your Honor. We will 6 strive to do so. Thank you. 7 THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Marcus, I think that's 8 the end of the agenda, right, for today? 9 MS. MARCUS: I think that's right, Your Honor. 10 Thank you very much. 11 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Very well. Thank 12 you. 13 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 11:09 AM) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Page 43 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Songa M. deslarshi Hyde 6 7 8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Veritext Legal Solutions 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 23 Mineola, NY 11501 24 25 Date: February 25, 2022

[& - affidavits]

. ,			
&	17 25:7 26:6 28:22	300 1:20 43:22	a
& 6:3,25	32:23 34:14,19	317 31:2	a.m. 1:24 3:3
0	35:6,13 37:1	330 43:21	able 11:2,7 12:4
	17.7 11:10	363 24:25	14:9
02:00 3:25	18-23538 1:3	377 31:10	absent 17:21
1	18.6 11:11	4	accept 21:1
1 4:1	19-08432 1:4 4:17	4 4:2	acceptable 31:24
1,200 10:3 13:14	196 11:21	400 6:20	accepted 10:24
1,300 10:3	2	444 12:8	accepting 32:20
1,500 13:14	2 4:1 17:24	5	access 8:6
1/13/2022 4:1	2/17/2022 3:7		account 22:2 38:8
1/20/2022 3:24	2/24/2022 4:24	5 4:2	accrual 16:7
4:19	20 12:8 17:13	50 11:2,25 12:5	accurate 15:12
10 4:3	24:18 27:11 28:3	14:1 51 11:25 12:4 14:2	43:4
10020 7:10	30:8 33:19	51 11:25 12:4 14:2 514 31:9	accurately 38:14
10036 7:3	20,000 9:16,17	547 22:3	acknowledged
10153 6:6	10:5 11:3,18	54	35:4
10194 3:17 4:4,10	200 9:13,16,23	55 17:24 55121 6:21	acknowledgement
10240 8:25	10:5 11:3 19:2		34:8
10289 3:17 4:11	21:16	6	actively 25:20
4:14	20005 6:14	6 4:2	additional 9:23
10294 3:8 8:22	2004 31:2	6.3 34:12,21 35:5	11:8
10295 8:24	2011 18:2	36:20	addressed 10:12
10298 3:17 4:15	2014 31:10	60 26:8	15:6 24:20 38:4
10305 3:18	2021 26:6	645 18:1	adjourned 23:4
10318 3:11	2022 1:23 3:2	6th 7:9	adjournment
10327 3:3	17:13,16 43:25	7	29:21
10601 1:21	214 11:20 12:9	7 4:3,24 5:1,3	administrative
10:05 1:24	230 11:19 12:9	29:18	6:11 9:4,7,10,14
114 18:1	16:10	70 10:14	10:17,20 11:16
11501 43:23	24 1:23 3:2 17:16	75 9:17 13:21	12:14,21 14:23
11:09 42:14	248 1:20	767 6:5	15:7,8 16:11,15
12.1 26:4	25 12:8 29:20	8	16:18
1211 7:2	43:25	_	admission 21:10
12151 43:6	25,000 11:18	8 4:3	admitted 18:25
1251 7:9	250 31:2	80 9:17 10:14	19:6,21
13 14:7,10	2600 6:20	8008 25:19	adv 1:4
130 18:1	28 29:7	9	adversary 4:17,23
1300 6:13	2nd 18:1 29:22	9 4:3,25	17:15,20 19:4
1334 29:8 33:18	3	900 6:13	21:11,13,25 22:6
34:2	3 4:2		advisors 9:10
14 14:7,10	30 20:9 22:15,17		affidavits 41:3
		ral Calutions	

Page 1

affirm 32:25 33:1	ames 31:1 32:17	annuared 0.25	avenue 6:5 7:2,9
affirmed 18:2	38:2	approved 9:25 approving 38:3	
afford 18:20		••	
	amount 11:22	argument 23:13	b
agenda 3:1 8:4,8,9	13:19 14:11 16:3	arising 31:5 aside 40:19	b 2:1 4:2 17:24
17:1,5 42:8	16:12		33:18 34:2
ago 41:16	amounts 15:4	asked 36:1 41:17	b.r. 31:2,10
agree 13:5 15:24	16:9	asking 32:14	back 23:2 27:4,5
27:18 31:8 37:1,5	announced 9:1	assert 10:10	30:25 38:17 41:10
37:6 40:10	10:6 11:8	asserting 38:6	bait 36:9
agreed 27:21	answer 4:20 17:17	assigned 32:13,13	bankr 31:2,10
28:10	19:15 36:6	32:20	bankruptcy 1:1
agreement 14:13	answerable 19:22	assignee 38:7	1:19 2:3 21:23
14:24 27:15 28:10	appeal 25:23	assignment 3:15	22:2,4 23:22
35:24 36:3 39:9	26:10 30:11 32:21	3:21 4:8 23:9	25:19 26:4,8
39:13 41:12,22	appear 17:16 18:6	24:16,20 25:7,25	31:16 33:7 38:3,9
ah 38:18	19:3 20:3,10	28:7 30:18 32:1	banned 21:22
ahead 14:20 15:10	appearance 17:21	38:4	bar 18:25 19:7,20
32:3 40:3	23:25	assume 8:16 28:4	21:2,9,10
aid 13:12	appearances 18:8	assumed 28:3	bargaining 14:13
al 1:8 8:4	23:14	assuming 39:18	basically 24:19
albanese 3:18	appeared 18:3	assumption 3:15	29:24 30:1 36:11
4:10	appearing 8:7	3:21 4:8 23:8	41:22
albeit 16:2	18:9,12 22:8	25:24 28:7 30:17	basis 20:6
alleged 30:20	23:20	assumptions 14:8	battle 25:23
allocation 12:10	appears 23:21	attachments 4:1	behalf 3:6,11,18
allow 11:12	27:24	attempt 25:12	3:23 4:11,15 5:2
allowed 10:2	appellate 24:21	30:21	14:22 18:10,12
14:11 15:5	26:3	attorney 4:20	20:10 22:8 23:20
alter 14:14,14	application 19:1,8	17:17 18:23	24:3
alternative 26:17	21:5,8 22:10 31:4	attorneys 6:4,11	belief 12:16 14:14
27:2	applied 25:4	6:19 7:1,8	believe 12:5 15:2
alternatively	apply 18:24 27:9	attractive 40:13	17:1,8 28:16
26:19	27:16 34:6 35:25	august 26:6	29:15 36:20
amend 13:8 39:11	36:3	authority 12:16	best 40:16
amended 4:19	appreciate 16:24	12:25 13:1,9,12	beyond 11:8
17:12	22:12 32:2 33:17	31:14	27:12
amendment 13:9	40:2 41:17	authorized 17:14	bird 40:22
amendments	appropriate	authorizes 13:18	board 10:15
39:12	27:25 34:9,13	authorizing 3:5	body 31:3
america 38:2	35:3	3:15,21 4:8 23:8	breach 38:25
40:13	approval 12:24	25:24	breaching 38:8
americas 7:2	approve 13:8	available 36:5	39:1
		38:20	
		ral Solutions	

[brief - contractor]

[brief - contractor]			1 age 3
brief 23:13	cent 16:8	13:15 14:23 15:6	conditions 12:2
briefed 31:19 32:2	cert 24:15,25	15:7,8 16:7,14,18	conduct 19:22
briefing 32:4	28:20 30:2 40:20	clear 19:16 20:18	conducted 3:2
35:16 37:3,7,25	certain 3:6 10:8	30:22 35:4 36:24	confer 39:4 40:4
39:11,16	13:19	38:5,5	conference 10:7
brigette 5:2	certainly 30:15	clearly 27:5 28:1	10:10
brought 36:12	33:17,25 34:2	32:7 41:14	confirm 26:22
build 39:17	39:2,3	clock 40:3	confirmation 9:4
burden 16:13	certificate 5:1	close 25:16	12:13 13:13,25
business 16:5 18:5	certified 43:3	code 22:4	15:23
20:24 33:6,8	certiorari 24:24	collected 14:9	confused 8:13
businessperson	26:14	collecting 11:5,24	connection 10:1
17:9	cetera 12:15,19	collectively 11:6	consent 9:4 14:3
buyer 25:8 38:7	12:22 13:21	collier 31:17	15:1,8,15,17,24
buyer's 25:12	challenging 32:19	colloquy 33:20	16:1,18,20
30:21	chambers 16:22	combine 39:20	consented 15:18
c	21:5	come 14:6 24:9	consider 33:23
	change 12:7	32:6 35:19	consistent 8:22,23
c 4:2 6:1 8:1 43:1	changes 12:2	coming 34:12	9:11 13:11 27:8
43:1	changing 9:15	comment 33:17	28:2
calendar 23:3	checking 9:20	34:5 40:25	constituents
29:19,23	checks 9:21	comments 33:16	10:19
called 19:1 21:7 28:15 31:11	chesley 3:23	committee 9:6,7	construction 1:15
	cir 18:1	10:18 11:15	4:18,21 17:6,18
cap 9:18 11:18	circuit 18:2 19:17	company 1:15	18:14,16 20:24
caption 21:12,12	24:14 25:14 26:2	4:18,21 17:7,18	consult 15:1
carolina 18:23,25	26:7,11,17,18,21	18:14,16,19 22:1	consultation 9:5
21:2,9	26:24 31:13 41:4	22:8	12:20
case 1:3,4 8:7 12:11 13:18 19:3	42:2	compel 3:20	consulted 11:14
21:15,25 22:6	cited 33:24	completely 38:21	15:9
24:7 32:17,18	citing 17:25	complied 36:20	consulting 15:9
36:7 38:25 39:5	city 17:25	comply 34:21	contact 19:12
caselaw 30:25	civil 17:24	conceded 31:21	contained 26:6
31:3 32:24	claim 16:8 38:25	conception 34:6	contemplate
cases 9:11,24	claimants 11:21	concern 15:22	25:20 30:11
17:25 31:7 33:23	13:18	25:6,17 36:19	contention 31:12
38:1,2	claimholders	39:10	contingency
cash 11:5 14:9	10:20	concession 34:7	28:15
cashed 9:22	claims 6:11 9:8,13	36:14	continue 10:10,12
categories 11:22	9:14,14,20 10:3	concluded 42:13	continuing 16:13
categories 11.22	10:10,12,17 11:7	condition 13:25	34:4,11
cause 4:19 17:12	11:16,17,19,20	25:6,10 34:22	contractor 18:20
17:14,16,22 20:5	12:3,8,14,18 13:3		
17.17,10,22 20.3			

[,		
controlling 31:12	38:3 39:12,16	debtors 1:10 8:16	discovery 39:17
copy 19:9	40:6,21 41:7,19	8:19 9:2,5,13 11:1	40:5
core 31:6 33:21	42:7,11	11:5,14 12:4,20	discretion 12:19
corp 17:6 38:2	court's 25:1 26:9	decide 29:4 39:22	12:20 15:3
corporate 17:23	29:3,8 31:4 33:15	42:2	discretionary
corporation 1:8	33:17	decided 10:6	12:23
1:12 3:7 4:18 5:3	courthouse 3:25	29:25 30:1 34:16	discussed 30:15
8:3 18:6 19:3 20:4	courtroom 3:25	deciding 30:4	36:22
correct 13:23 21:3	courts 19:19 33:8	decision 31:1	discussion 27:10
27:1,15,23 28:25	craig 3:11 7:12	40:20,21	disposition 26:13
couched 27:11	23:18	decisions 31:12,14	dispute 23:5
counsel 4:22 9:9	creditors 11:3	31:15	32:10
15:7 17:8,19 18:4	14:1 16:11,15	declaring 21:23	disputed 11:7
18:7,21,22 19:24	crossed 38:17	deem 33:1	disputes 20:1
19:25 20:9 21:20	cure 33:21	deep 40:17	24:13
22:6 23:25 29:22	cured 38:10	default 17:23 18:3	disregarding
counterparty	current 27:17	20:7,8 22:17	31:12
25:10	cut 36:9	defendant 1:16	distinction 15:10
country 19:17	d	4:21,22 17:9,18	32:22
33:8 43:21	d 2:2 4:2 8:1	17:19 18:3,6	distinguishing
couple 23:15 39:5	d.c. 6:14	defendant's 17:21	37:24
41:22	date 9:7 10:18	defer 20:7	distributing 11:10
course 29:18	11:15 41:25 43:25	deficiencies 9:11	distribution 9:3,3
37:25	days 20:9 22:15	delay 25:22	10:1 11:1,2,8,13
court 1:1,19 8:2	22:17 26:8 39:5	department 31:1	11:17,25 13:10,19
8:20 9:12 12:12	de 9:13 10:1 11:17	depending 9:18	14:1,10 16:4,5
12:23 13:1,5,17	12:3,7 13:1,2,5,18	37:22	distributions 3:6
13:24 14:12,20,25	15:4	depends 30:16	9:12,19 10:5
15:13,16,20 16:25	deadline 26:6,6,8	described 16:21	11:24 12:17
17:3 18:7,13,17	26:18 27:7,16	designated 25:9	district 1:2 19:7
18:21,24 19:6,14	28:1 33:6	25:11,12 30:21	21:11 24:14 31:8
19:20 20:13,17,23	deadlines 33:8	detail 29:14	31:13,14,16
21:4,7,24 22:13	37:9	determination	divestiture 25:4
22:15,22,24 23:2	deal 16:6 20:1	24:24 25:1,5	30:10
23:19,23 24:1,6,9	35:18 36:12 37:7	32:16	divesture 29:7
24:12,14,25 26:4	37:20 40:3	determined 9:5	dla 7:7 23:18
26:4,9 27:5,20,24	dealing 9:21,22	difference 14:25	docket 8:22,24,25
28:23 29:1 30:4	12:14 22:5 32:23	different 20:3	19:9 21:14 22:18
31:13,14,24 33:4	dealt 17:11 22:4	38:24	doctrine 25:4 29:7
33:7,7,12,20,25	25:17 38:2 41:14	differently 30:19	30:10
34:17 35:7,12,17	debt 22:2	38:15	document 3:17,20
35:22 36:22 37:14	debtor 6:4 16:3	difficult 41:21	4:10,14,24 5:1
37:15,17,21,22	17:8		40:1
			L

[doing - full]

Г	I		
doing 17:7 19:25	entry 18:2	faces 24:8	fine 14:12 22:22
dollars 10:14	erika 6:16 14:22	facing 33:4	23:19
door 11:11	established 18:5	fact 15:23 24:22	fingers 38:17
drain 2:2 8:3	et 1:8 8:3 12:15,18	34:10,24 35:2,24	finish 33:11
draw 15:11	12:22 13:21	36:21 37:25 39:25	first 8:8 10:1
drive 6:20	event 8:15 27:24	fail 3:6 6:8 8:18	12:13 13:4,13
due 3:7 4:1 28:21	evidence 30:12	8:19,21 12:23	16:6 23:14 28:12
duly 17:14	evidentiary 29:19	13:11,23 14:4,18	29:1 32:4,8 33:16
e	30:12 39:17,21	14:24 15:14 16:22	34:8,18,20,25
e 2:1,1 4:2 6:1,1	exact 10:2	16:23 17:1	35:2,15 36:1,5,9
8:1,1 43:1	exactly 36:19	fair 12:10	36:13 37:2,4,4,19
eagan 6:20	41:17	fairly 17:11	38:12,14 39:11,14
eagan 0.20 earlier 29:6 31:14	example 12:18	fall 9:18	39:21 41:25
ecf 3:3,8,11,18 4:4	exchanged 39:25	falls 30:23	fish 36:9
4:11,15,25 5:3	exclusive 24:19	far 16:10 30:7	five 14:7
ecro 2:5	34:3	35:8 41:11	flesh 20:6
effective 9:7 10:18	execution 13:12	fashion 13:9	focus 25:6 41:23
11:15	exercise 15:3	fast 37:21	focusing 32:7
efforts 11:6	36:13 38:11,20	february 1:23 3:2	following 10:25
ehrlich 3:17 4:10	exercised 28:12	17:16 29:18,22	12:12 13:13 35:18
either 26:17 38:4	exercising 12:20	43:25	35:18
40:10	36:4 39:1	federal 18:7 26:3	foregoing 43:3
email 21:5 29:18	exhibit 4:1,2,2,2,2	37:15	forget 10:2
emanuel 6:10	4:3,3,3,3,4	fee 21:16,17	form 19:10 27:6
14:22	expected 12:8	feel 33:25 34:2	37:5 39:14,22
employment	expecting 33:14	fell 14:5	41:18 42:1
19:18	expense 6:11	felt 19:11	forms 9:21 26:17
emulating 31:16	12:21 14:23 16:11	fifth 6:5	forth 17:22 30:19
enforce 3:14,21	16:15 35:21	fight 40:8,14	forward 9:11 10:6
4:7 23:8 24:16	expenses 11:6	file 8:21 10:12	34:12
28:7 37:16	expire 25:15,22	21:4 23:21	found 39:18
enforcing 30:23	explained 19:21	filed 3:6,10,17,23	four 31:14
enormous 31:3	explanation 8:15	4:10,14,21 5:2	fourth 9:3 16:4
ensued 25:24	8:16	8:24 10:7 17:17	frankly 39:20
enter 16:21	extension 25:14	19:15 28:22,24	free 38:4,5
entered 8:14	26:18 27:25	filing 10:25 21:17	friday 41:23,24
17:13,24 21:14	extent 22:7	26:13	frivolous 31:12
34:24	extra 11:22 36:14	filling 22:19	front 31:21 32:7
entering 20:6	f	financial 9:10	34:15 37:8
entities 18:5	f 2:1 4:3 43:1	find 21:16 22:18	frustrating 31:25
entitlement 10:4	f.3d 18:1	35:22 40:16	full 13:16 16:12
entity 17:23 28:11	face 24:4	finds 35:17	16:15 19:18 27:13
		1.7.1.1	
Veritext Legal Solutions			

[fully - injunctive]

fully 33:13	good 8:2,18,20,21	handled 17:2	41:15 42:4,5,9
further 8:14	10:25 12:9 14:21	happy 8:4 15:15	honor's 39:2
10:23 12:10 16:2	18:11 21:8 23:17	23:13 33:11 39:3	hook 31:23 32:11
future 13:6	24:2,3,6	39:6,10	hopefully 41:5,12
g	gotshal 6:3 8:19	hard 32:11 38:24	house 18:21,22
g 4:3 8:1	gotten 22:1	he'll 21:16	19:24 20:9,14
galardi 7:5 24:2,3	grace 1:15 4:18	head 36:18	21:14,20 22:6,9
24:8,11 27:16,18	4:21 7:15 17:6,18	heads 32:5	hundred 13:20
27:23 28:20,21,24	18:13,15,15,16,17	hear 23:13,18	14:6 16:8
32:25 39:4 40:4	18:19,22 19:5,11	36:6 37:21	hyde 5:25 43:3,8
41:15,15 42:4	20:10,11,15,22	heard 8:5	i
galardi's 34:5	21:3,6,21 22:11	hearing 3:1,1,5,10	i.e. 12:17 22:2
garrett 3:6 6:8	22:14,21,23	3:13,13,20,24 4:6	24:16 33:6
8:18	grant 12:1 15:22	4:13,17,24 5:1	idea 33:16 35:11
gatekeeping 29:9	granted 13:12	8:23 9:1 24:17	identified 13:3
gather 8:15 27:14	19:2 24:25 25:14	27:11 28:3 29:19	identify 28:11
generally 14:24	26:12 30:2 40:21	30:8,12,15 39:14	identifying 28:10
15:5,11 19:7 27:7	granting 3:16,22	39:18,21,22 41:25	ids 9:21
gerber 31:6	4:9 23:10	hearings 8:4	ii 3:16,22 4:9
gerber's 31:1	gray 6:25	held 3:24 4:24	important 20:24
give 20:9 22:15	great 40:8	14:8	32:22
25:18 37:4 39:9	greenville 1:15	help 23:15	improperly 25:11
given 14:7 16:6	4:19,22 17:7,18	helpful 33:15	30:20 35:14
28:18	18:14	hire 20:11 21:18	inclined 12:1
giving 32:5	gregg 7:5 24:2	21:19	include 36:2
glad 8:9 41:2	41:15	hit 11:2 36:17	included 9:7
gm 38:2	gregory 4:14	holdco 3:11,14,18	includes 19:20
go 8:5 11:11,14	grounds 31:11	3:24 4:7,11 7:8	34:7
14:20 16:4 17:5	group 12:21	23:5,7,21 25:5	including 10:20
20:19 21:18 22:18	guess 21:21 26:15	holders 11:16	30:25
23:2 32:3 35:7	27:21 30:25 32:5	holding 1:12 4:15	inconsistent 15:4
36:16 39:19 40:3	36:1 37:19	4:17 5:2 17:6	increase 9:10
41:10	guidance 36:15	holdings 1:8 3:7	11:17,18,24 16:3
goal 10:13 16:16	h	3:16,22 4:9 7:1	indicated 27:7
16:16	h 4:3	8:3 23:5,9 24:3	indicative 25:18
goes 9:17 29:13	ha 38:18	hon 2:2	26:2,19 27:8
40:23	hac 19:1,21 20:10	honor 8:18 9:25	indiscernible 17:2
going 8:16 9:11	20:20 21:7,10	11:20 12:1 14:21	individuals 9:9
12:6 17:2 20:7,9	22:10	15:19 16:23 18:11	20:2
30:25 31:22,23	half 11:23 16:14	23:1,17 24:2,11	information 22:20
32:3,8 33:12	hand 14:19 31:18	27:1,4,23 28:21	initially 25:8
35:19,25 37:21	37:20 40:22	28:25 32:25 33:10	injunctive 32:1
38:18,22	37.20 10.22	34:15 36:18 39:25	37:15
30.10,22			37.13

- February 24 [ins - mart]	2022 Hearing Transcri	ot Pg 51 of 57	Page 7
ins 11:20	J	arge 11:16 25:2	liquidation 31:9

ins 11:20	i	large 11:16 25:2	liquidation 31:9
intended 28:23,24	J • 4.4 C.02 10.11	larger 10:20	listed 8:8 28:17
interest 10:11,25	j 4:4 6:23 18:11	13:25	litigation 18:4
11:13 13:20 16:7	january 17:13	latest 23:4	19:22 25:23 28:15
38:7,8	24:18 27:11 28:3	law 8:11 20:19	32:21 36:16
interfacing 20:2	30:8 33:19	lawyer 18:18,20	little 8:12
interfere 25:11	job 19:12	19:12,22 20:2,11	llc 3:11,16,18,22
interfering 30:20	joseph 7:15 18:15	20:16,25 21:1,19	3:24 4:9,11,15 7:1
35:14	judge 2:3 8:2 9:1	21:19 22:9	18:1 23:5,9 24:3
interpret 32:14	12:24 13:23 14:5	lawyers 19:18	llc's 3:14 4:7 23:7
33:22	31:1,6	20:19	llp 6:3,10,18,25
interpretation	judgement 18:3	lay 33:13 35:8	located 25:21
31:5	20:8	lead 35:21	long 14:13 17:4
interpreting	judges 31:7,16	learned 41:16	18:4,24 41:16
30:23 32:12 33:23	judgment 17:23	lease 3:15,22 4:8	look 21:14 22:7
interrogatories	20:7 22:17	23:9 25:9,11,13	31:24 34:1 35:7
19:15	jurisdiction 10:11	28:9 30:22 31:25	41:5
involved 19:25	26:10 29:3,5,8	32:13,14,15 34:13	looked 41:3
21:17	30:5,9,14,22 31:6	34:22 35:3 36:7	lose 38:22
involvement 9:23	33:21 34:3,4,16	37:16 38:8 39:1	lot 19:9 30:24
issuance 24:23	35:17,23 37:3,10	leave 11:19,21	41:8
26:12	39:16,19 42:3	leaves 34:14	
issue 14:15 24:25	jurisdictional	leaving 12:9	m
25:2 26:5,9 29:3,6	29:6,11,23 31:11	ledanski 5:25 43:3	m 24:25
	35:16 37:7 39:10	43:8	m3 10:13
29:9,9,13,15,23	39:23	left 26:23 27:22	mailings 9:22
30:8,13,17 31:4	k		majority 13:15
31:18,20,20,21	k 17:6 22:16	legal 43:20	making 9:19
32:2,5,8 34:18	keep 10:13	length 33:13	11:13 23:24 36:5
35:13 36:24 37:20	keeping 9:20 41:8	letter 3:10 29:24	38:20
37:23 40:23	kind 32:9 36:8	37:18	mall 3:16,22 4:9
issued 24:22	kmart 1:12 4:17	letting 33:10	4:15 7:1 23:5,9
31:15	5:2	leverage 41:8	24:3 40:13
issues 16:6 22:3	know 9:22 15:14	li 41:25	management
25:3 27:22,25	27:19,21 29:17	licensed 18:23	29:23
28:6,17 29:3,4,23	31:19 33:4 36:22	likelihood 37:14	mandate 24:22,23
29:25 30:3,6,12	37:18,22 38:1,22	limit 13:6 36:4,8	26:13 28:18
32:4,18,19 33:18	38:25 39:6,21	limitation 12:17	manges 6:3
34:15 35:18 38:3	40:18,21 41:11,13	38:19	manner 35:19
39:9,10 41:21	41:20	limitations 28:8	march 28:22
item 17:1,5		limited 3:10 13:3	29:20
iteration 24:12	1	26:5 40:1	marcus 42:7,9
	language 13:3	limits 36:19	mart 17:6 22:16
	35:14		
		gal Solutions	

[martin - outside]

	T			
martin 3:11 7:12	36:3 38:15,21	needs 19:25 21:4	21:6 22:11,13,22	
23:17,18,20,24	41:5	negotiating 41:8	22:23,24 23:2	
26:1,22 27:1,19	moac's 23:25	new 1:2 6:6 7:3,10	24:1,6 27:5 28:23	
31:20 32:3 33:10	26:12 29:21	17:25 18:23 19:7	29:1 33:4 39:15	
33:15 34:19 35:11	modest 16:12	19:8 20:16 21:11	40:6 41:19 42:7	
36:17 39:2,15,24	21:17	21:19 24:4,7,8	42:11	
41:2,18 42:5	modification	news 10:25 12:9	old 24:7,8 43:21	
matter 1:6 8:8,9	14:16 15:3,17,19	non 9:14 11:20	open 27:22 34:15	
12:19 16:5 17:5	15:25 16:1	note 26:11	opposed 24:18	
17:10 18:9 21:13	modified 16:22	notice 3:1,5,10,13	31:23	
23:3,6 27:3 29:4	moment 39:18	4:6,13 8:10,12,21	opposite 20:17,18	
30:5,9,14 31:6	monetary 32:1	10:7,22 11:1	opposition 16:17	
32:22 34:4,15	money 9:15 40:9	12:17 23:6,10,21	16:19 24:20	
35:10	40:11,14,22	notices 8:24	opt 9:14,14 11:20	
matters 3:1 8:5	moot 30:3	notified 34:24	11:20 12:15,15	
23:4	morabito 6:16	noting 26:2	oral 23:13	
mcgrath 5:2	14:19,20,21,22	number 10:3	order 3:5,13,14	
mean 41:20	15:18	11:18 21:15	3:21 4:6,7,14,19	
meet 39:4	morning 8:2,18	numbers 13:15	8:10,14 9:4 12:13	
meetable 16:16	8:20,21 14:21	nw 6:13	13:2,2,6,12 15:6	
member 21:1,8	18:11 23:17 24:2	ny 1:21 6:6 7:3,10	15:20 16:21,22	
memorandum	24:6	43:23	17:12,13 20:5	
8:11	motion 3:14,20,20	0	23:7,8 24:16,21	
mentioned 10:17	4:7 8:11 12:1	o 2:1 8:1 43:1	25:7,19,24 26:1,7	
merits 32:18	15:21,22 20:10		26:7 27:2,7 28:5,8	
mickalis 18:1	23:7 24:15,17,22	object 34:11 35:2	29:2,10 30:7,18	
million 10:14	26:12,16,20,23,23	36:21	30:23,24 31:4	
11:11,11	27:3 28:7,14,19	objected 23:11	32:12,13,20 33:22	
mind 41:11	28:19	objection 4:13	33:23 34:14 35:13	
minds 10:23	motors 31:9	23:12 29:2 30:6	35:15,17 36:25	
mineola 43:23	move 10:6 17:23	objections 3:7	37:5,8 38:11,23	
minimis 9:13 10:1	22:16	10:16	39:5,11,13,14,23	
11:17 12:3,7 13:1	moved 20:8	obtaining 25:22	40:2 41:10,12,18	
13:2,5,18 15:4	n	obviously 29:8	42:1,2	
minnesota 37:14		39:6,19	ordered 17:14	
37:15	n 6:1 8:1 43:1	occupying 40:12	orders 9:12	
mn 6:21	nail 36:17	ofac 9:21	original 34:3	
moac 3:15,22 4:8	name 18:9	offer 28:12 37:11	otsuka 4:14	
4:15 7:1,8 23:5,9	nature 8:13 18:7	41:4	otsuka's 29:24	
23:11,21 24:3,5	necessarily 40:15	offered 27:18,20	37:18	
24:18,23 26:16	need 19:12 20:1	okay 8:2 12:12	ought 36:23	
27:20 29:3 30:19	20:18 22:7 30:11	13:24 14:20 15:21	outside 21:18	
30:20 31:25 32:19	33:25 35:15 36:24	16:25 17:3 18:13	5465140 21.10	
30.20 31.23 32.17		18:17 19:5 20:11		
Veritext Legal Solutions				

[overall - question]

			_
overall 14:3	32:24 34:23 35:14	precedent 18:5	proceeding 4:17
owed 9:16 10:5	35:25 37:1 38:10	preference 22:1	4:23 17:15,20
owner 18:19 36:9	38:16 39:17 41:13	prejudice 37:11	18:7 19:4 21:12
38:6	permit 10:8,8	premises 25:9,12	21:13,25
р	permitted 13:14	30:21	proceedings 22:6
p 6:1,1 8:1	permitting 9:12	prepared 9:2	42:13 43:4
paid 12:18 14:6	person 21:4,8,14	25:18	process 24:21
15:4 33:21 38:5	22:9	prepetition 10:9	program 9:4
paragraph 25:7	personally 31:15	present 7:14	12:16
32:23 34:14,19,20	personam 29:4	presentation 8:23	progress 12:10
35:6,13 37:1	petition 24:15,24	presentment 3:5	projected 11:1
paragraphs 22:20	26:13 30:2 40:20	4:6,13 8:11,12,22	proper 39:14,22
41:22	petrie 30:25 32:17	10:7,22 23:6,11	42:1
part 16:4 17:7	38:1	president 18:16	properly 28:12,18
25:2 30:16 34:20	piper 7:7 23:18	pressing 25:17	property 34:23
	place 22:5	36:14	proportion 13:15
particular 23:6	plains 1:21 3:25	pretty 19:10	propose 12:2
parties 9:16,23 10:5,11,15,25	plaintiff 1:13 6:19	21:17 30:22 39:25	proposed 8:10
	17:8,23 18:12	prevent 31:25	11:17 12:5 25:16
11:4,13,13,23	22:16	previewed 10:9	27:17 28:9,15
12:15 14:10,16 15:24 17:15 18:8	plan 13:8,13,18	previous 10:5	33:3
	14:14,15,16 15:5	previously 9:25	proposition 31:9
23:14,15 24:13 28:10 32:7 35:12	15:25 16:2	11:9 30:18	provided 35:6
	plans 13:18	primarily 8:6	provision 13:22
37:23 40:17	pleadings 21:15	primary 24:19	32:23 34:11 36:8
party 19:23 38:6	plenty 31:7	25:6	38:11,14
passed 38:19	pm 3:25	prior 13:1,2,5	provisions 32:15
paul 6:21	point 10:4 16:14	21:22 32:16	38:8
pawn 18:1	29:11 31:3,11,19	priority 10:9	purpose 20:5 26:5
pay 10:14 11:23	32:12 37:7,12,13	pro 7:15 17:22	33:9
12:4 16:8,14	38:13,21,23 39:3	19:1,21 20:2,10	purposes 21:11
paying 40:19	39:13,23 42:3	20:20 21:7,10	32:20
payment 10:8	points 33:14,24	22:10	pursuant 9:3
13:14 16:12,12	35:16 41:25	probably 17:10	17:24 26:3
22:2	portion 25:9	32:6 36:23 41:20	put 10:22 30:1,18
pending 24:23	33:19 34:22 39:4	problem 14:12	35:15,16 37:8
26:13 28:19 32:21	portrait 38:2	34:10	38:15 39:11
40:2	possible 30:3	procedure 10:2	putting 27:3
percent 9:17,17	37:19	12:14 17:25 26:3	
11:2,25 12:4	posture 23:16	procedures 15:6	q
13:20,21 14:1,2,6	pre 9:6 10:18	22:5	qualifying 40:17
14:7,11	11:15	proceed 17:22	quarropas 1:20
period 25:15		40:4	question 11:12
27:12 30:24 31:22			12:6 14:2 15:16

[question - says]

Page 10

	I		
26:16	reducing 11:6	16:19 17:15	36:13,21 38:12,14
questions 12:13	referenced 24:16	representative's	39:1,24 42:8,9,11
23:15	referred 33:5,5	15:8	rights 34:19 40:11
quick 33:16	refusal 34:9,18,25	representing 24:5	road 43:21
quickly 17:11	35:2 36:1,5,10,13	request 16:2	robert 2:2 3:10
quinn 6:10 14:22	38:12,14	28:14 29:21	rofo 28:12 38:18
quite 28:17 39:6	reject 35:1	requested 21:10	38:20 39:1
quoted 30:18	rejected 35:5	requests 27:2 40:1	room 1:20
r	rejection 34:12	required 30:13	ropes 6:25
r 2:1 6:1 8:1 43:1	related 3:16,16,20	reserve 11:7	roughly 16:10
rachel 3:17 4:10	3:23 4:9,9,14,23	36:20	round 13:4
raise 14:15 29:22	5:1 23:10 24:17	reserving 40:11	routine 21:13
30:5	relatively 16:12	resolution 26:9	routinely 19:1
raised 14:19 28:6	relief 3:16,23 4:9	resolve 35:13	rule 17:24 19:16
29:3,7,16,23 30:6	8:13 15:25 23:10	resolving 27:3	19:18 20:3,18
30:9,14	24:17 26:17,25	41:13	23:22 25:19 26:3
raising 32:18	32:1,1 37:15	respect 15:3 26:19	ruled 29:13,15
rdd 1:3,4 3:25	remain 29:19	26:20 28:9 33:2,3	33:18
4:17	remaining 11:3	34:6	rules 17:24
reach 39:9,13	11:25 12:4	respond 33:11,14	ruling 25:18 26:3
41:12	remand 3:10	responded 19:15	26:5,20 27:8
reached 10:19	23:22 26:19 36:25	35:1	36:15 37:9
reaction 37:18	38:23 39:4,13	response 24:5	run 31:22
read 13:2 23:12	41:14	29:12,14,21	running 18:4
ready 37:23	remanded 26:21	responses 4:1	S
realize 38:22	42:2	restructuring 9:6	s 3:17 4:10,14,14
really 13:8 19:16	remands 26:4	result 11:10 35:22	4:24 5:1 6:1 8:1
19:18 22:20 25:2	remarks 28:2	retail 30:25 32:17	s.d.n.y. 31:2,10
29:1,7,9,10,13,14	30:7	38:1	sale 38:3
29:16,22 30:5,9	remember 36:6	retained 4:22	samples 22:19
30:16,24 31:2,21	38:14	17:19	satisfied 11:19,21
32:12 36:12	remotely 8:5	retains 26:10	11:22 12:3 13:16
reason 10:22	rent 40:19,19	retired 18:20	15:25 28:16 33:2
19:19 24:19 35:25	rep 10:17 11:16	reversed 31:10	34:8,11
reasonable 27:12	reply 23:12 29:17	review 33:18	satisfy 9:13 10:2
28:4	report 8:25 37:19	richard 3:23 6:23	10:14 11:3 12:3,9
recalculating 11:7	represent 4:23	18:11	saw 23:24
receive 9:15	17:20 19:3	right 12:24 15:22	saw 23.24 saying 15:9 29:12
receiving 16:11	representation	18:20 20:14,22	29:18 31:24 34:10
record 20:1 27:10	4:20 17:17	23:2,18,23 26:23	36:11,12 38:16,18
33:1,1 43:4	representative	27:20 28:12,20	40:15
reding 6:23 18:11	6:12 9:8,8 12:21	34:8,12,18,25	says 21:8 29:24
18:12 22:25 23:1	14:23 15:7,13,17	35:1,5 36:1,5,5,9	31:3 32:13 34:20
10.12 22.23 23.1			31.3 32.13 37.20
Veritext Legal Solutions			

[says - terms] Page 11

			1 480 11
38:11	share 10:24	speed 24:9	40:10,16,17
schedule 32:3	shoehorn 32:10	squarely 33:24	successful 11:5
37:21	shop 18:1	st 6:21	sued 38:7
scheduled 3:1	short 14:5,7 29:14	stage 26:15	sufficient 17:22
17:12 29:20	show 4:19 17:12	standalone 36:8	suggest 37:9
scheduling 3:13	17:13,16 20:5	standing 21:9	suggesting 25:18
4:6,13 23:7 28:5	shown 30:19	state 18:9 21:9	35:20
29:2,10 30:7 35:9	side 40:10	31:23 37:14	suggestion 40:7
35:15,17 37:8	sign 10:18 22:24	stated 15:12 17:14	suing 22:1
39:11,12 40:2	signature 43:6	25:7 26:2	suite 6:13,20
41:10,11 42:1	signed 4:19	statements 33:17	43:22
school 20:20	significant 16:7	states 1:1,19	sullivan 6:10
screen 8:7 17:10	16:13,17	29:17 31:13	summarize 39:3
se 7:15 17:22 20:2	similar 10:4	stating 35:1	support 10:23
sears 1:8 3:7 8:3	simple 22:20	status 8:24 10:7	11:15
19:2 21:15	simply 34:10	10:10	supporting 8:12
second 18:2 19:16	sir 18:15 19:11,14	stay 24:23 26:12	supportive 10:21
23:3 26:2 31:13	21:21 22:11	28:18	supreme 24:24
39:16 41:4	situation 25:20	step 23:4 28:5	25:1 31:13 37:22
secondly 16:10	six 26:3	32:4	40:21
section 30:17	skip 17:4	stores 31:1	sure 8:14 13:7
34:21 36:19	small 11:22	street 1:20 6:13	14:4,5 23:24 24:7
see 14:18 24:3	smaller 9:19	strive 42:6	24:9 31:22 32:11
37:19 38:10 40:10	12:18	stuff 21:22	34:17 36:14 41:7
40:25	solutions 43:20	subject 24:15,21	t
seeing 32:11	solve 34:10	29:4 30:5,8,14	t 43:1,1
37:25 38:24	somewhat 8:10	34:4,15 35:2	take 10:15 17:4
seek 32:1	son 1:15 4:18,21	37:25	18:8 23:14 41:20
seeking 16:3 25:5	17:6,18 18:14,16	sublease 26:18	talk 8:17 40:25
26:24 37:15	20:10	28:15 33:3,7 34:7	talked 33:20
seen 23:23 26:1	sonya 5:25 43:3,8	34:25 41:22	tax 9:21 16:6
selected 9:8	sorry 25:19 33:12	sublet 25:8,12	taxes 10:9
send 16:22	sort 20:19 26:15	30:21	taxing 10:11
sense 16:6,8	32:5	submit 34:3,14	tba 3:25
sensitive 33:8	sought 8:10,13	submitted 15:20	telephone 8:7
sent 29:18	23:10 25:21 26:17	27:3 39:5 41:3	telephonically 6:8
sentence 36:18	south 18:23,25	subsidiary 25:3	6:16,23 7:5,12,14
separate 34:20,21	21:2,9	substantial 14:10	tell 37:6
service 5:1	southern 1:2 19:7	subtenancy 40:11	ten 14:8
set 22:3 27:25	21:10 31:8,16	subtenant 25:16	tenant 31:24 34:9
30:19 40:19	space 40:12	25:21,21,23 27:17	34:13 35:3,3 36:3
setting 17:21	specific 22:3	28:9 33:2,3 36:4 37:12 38:16 40:9	terms 15:5 20:20
26:15		37:12 38:10 40:9	20:23 27:12 33:6

[terms - years]

- •			· ·
41:12	timing 30:17	type 13:21 14:13	w
thank 16:23 21:21	31:19,20 34:18	16:8 19:8	waive 38:16
22:11,23 23:1	37:12 38:13 39:10	types 22:5	waived 33:2
42:4,5,6,10,11	today 10:23 24:5	u	want 13:7,17 15:2
thanks 14:21	33:24 35:10,20	u.s. 2:3	17:3 19:19 22:7
23:19	42:8	ucc 9:9	26:22 34:5 35:7
thing 22:19 27:5	today's 8:4	ultimately 35:9	36:2,16 37:18,22
35:15 36:24 37:2	told 11:16 26:7	40:8	wanted 13:24
37:4,4	tolled 26:8	unable 39:8	14:15 15:23 21:22
things 20:20	tomorrow 41:23	uncontested 8:9	33:13 39:24
think 12:8,9,10,24	touched 25:3	underlying 28:7	washington 6:14
12:25 13:1,11,21	track 9:20 16:13	underlying 26.7 understand 19:14	washington 0.14
14:18,24,25 15:6	trade 9:20	20:19,20,23 23:16	wasted 30:4
15:11 17:4,10	transaction 25:16	24:4 33:25 36:2	way 37:23 38:12
20:13 23:3 26:20	transcribed 5:25	37:13 38:13,21	we've 36:20 41:4
28:17,19,21 29:1	transcript 33:19	39:2 40:18	websites 10:13
29:9,13,20 30:9	43:4	understanding	week 41:20
30:14,16,22 31:3	transform 3:11,14	13:7	weil 6:3 8:19
32:4,6,9,19,22	3:18,24 4:7,11 7:8	undisputed 16:9	went 15:10
33:5 35:14 36:7	17:2,5 23:5,7,20	united 1:1,19	white 1:21 3:25
36:12,17,23 37:3	24:15 25:5,8,15	31:13	willing 41:5
37:13,24 38:15,21	25:20 27:19 28:2	unopposed 16:2	woods 6:20
39:3 41:10,16,19	28:4 29:17 33:20	update 39:8,25	words 12:19
41:23 42:7,9	35:21 37:12	updating 10:13	14:25 41:9
third 17:5 28:14	transform's 29:12	urquhart 6:10	work 41:18,21
thought 10:24	travelers 38:1	usc 29:8	worked 10:16
20:15	treatise 31:17	use 20:24 21:20	31:8
thoughts 33:16	tros 33:9		worthy 16:16
thousand 10:3	true 15:14 43:4	V	writ 26:14
three 10:4 28:6	trying 35:8	v 1:14 4:18 17:6	wrong 27:15
29:25 31:15	turn 23:25	18:1	
threshold 12:7	turned 38:7	valuable 35:21	X
threw 41:2	two 12:2 22:20	vargas 2:5	x 1:5,11,17
throw 40:7	23:9 25:9,15,21	veritext 43:20	y
throwing 40:24	26:5 27:7,12,13	versus 15:1	yeah 33:12 41:7
41:9	28:1,6,17 29:2,4	vice 19:1 20:20	year 25:15 26:5
ticking 40:3	29:25 30:3,12,24	21:7,10	27:7 28:1 30:24
time 9:20 10:4	31:22 32:4,9,18	videoconference	31:22 32:24 34:23
13:13 22:18 26:25	32:19,24 33:16	4:25	35:13,24 37:1
29:2 30:2,4 32:11	34:6,10,23 35:13	view 14:17 27:2	38:10,16 41:13
35:21 36:4,8,19	35:24 37:1 38:10	viewing 33:22	years 25:10,22
37:4 38:24	38:16,19 39:21		27:12,13 32:9
	41:13,25		34:6,10 38:19

[york - zoomgov]

york 1:2 6:6 7:3 7:10 18:1,23 19:7 19:8 20:16 21:11 21:19

Z

zoom 3:2 8:6 **zoomgov** 4:25 Page 13